



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/690,037

10/21/2003

Steven P. Kim

4541-007

3999

24112

7590

04/17/2006

COATS & BENNETT, PLLC
P O BOX 5
RALEIGH, NC 27602

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/690,037	Applicant(s) KIM, STEVEN P.	
	Examiner James H. Blackwell	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/21/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an original application filed 10/21/2003 with a priority date of **10/21/2003**.
2. Claims 1-18 are currently pending. Claims 1, 9, and 14 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoag (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,848 filed 01/06/1999, issued 11/06/2001) in view of Gibb et al. (hereinafter Gibb, U.S. Patent No. 6,225,996 filed 02/20/1998, issued 05/01/2001).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 9, and 14), Hoag teaches *displaying a portion of said table in a viewable area of said window* (see Figs. 5-6 depict a viewable portion of a table in a window).

Hoag also teaches that for *at least one row of said table, displaying information from one or more columns outside said viewable area in a hovering row* (Figs. 5-6 depict Columns numbered 7-12 which were outside the viewable area now visible below the portion of the table (Cols. 1-6) that were previously visible). It is noted that the table configuration depicted in Figs. 5-6 of Hoag do not explicitly teach *hovering* rows, as claimed. However, Gibb teaches a hovering row in a prior art depiction of a table where

Art Unit: 2176

columns labeled G-J are overlaying columns labeled E-H. Columns I-J were off screen and not visible previously (Fig. 7).

Also, Gibb teaches in the present invention the ability to view row data that would normally be off the screen (Fig. 8 depicts rows 324-329, where a value of Row A327 is displayed in a viewable area of the screen). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hoag and Gibb as both inventions relate to the display of tables and also the display of off-screen information in a visible area. Adding the teaching of Gibb provides the benefit of observing the results of certain operations without scrolling to those areas, which are off the screen.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Hoag teaches that *said hovering row is displayed below said displayed row* (Figs. 5-6; Columns labeled 7-12 are depicted as being placed below Columns labeled 7-12; Rows 1-10 below same rows numbered 1-10). However, Hoag does not teach a *hovering row*. However, Gibb teaches a *hovering row* (Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hoag and Gibb as both inventions relate to the display of tables and also the display of off-screen information in a visible area. Adding the teaching of Gibb provides the benefit of observing the results of certain operations without scrolling to those areas, which are off the screen.

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Hoag teaches *displaying column headers above said hovering row* (Figs. 5-6; Column headers numbered 7-12 (e.g., Time Stamp, Composite: Relation) above Columns 7-12). However, Hoag does not teach a *hovering*

Art Unit: 2176

row. However, Gibb teaches a *hovering row* (Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hoag and Gibb as both inventions relate to the display of tables and also the display of off-screen information in a visible area. Adding the teaching of Gibb provides the benefit of observing the results of certain operations without scrolling to those areas, which are off the screen.

In regard to dependent Claim 4 (and similarly dependent Claims 10, and 15), Hoag fails to teach that *said hovering row is dynamically displayed or not displayed, in response to a user input*. However, Gibb teaches such a limitation (Col. 2, lines 51-64; user selects a cell for display regardless of whether it is on or off screen). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hoag and Gibb as both inventions relate to the display of tables and also the display of off-screen information in a visible area. Adding the teaching of Gibb provides the benefit of observing the results of certain operations without scrolling to those areas, which are off the screen.

In regard to dependent Claim 5 (and similarly dependent Claims 12, and 17), Hoag fails to teach that *said user input comprises moving a mouse pointer over an icon associated with said displayed row*. However, Gibb teaches such a limitation (Col. 2, lines 51-64; suggests a plurality of means of user inputs are possible including selecting an icon with a mouse pointer). It is further noted that selecting icons or buttons to invoke actions in a spreadsheet is well known (i.e., toolbar icons in MS Excel). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hoag and Gibb as both inventions relate to the display of tables and also the display of off-screen information in a visible area. Adding the teaching of Gibb provides the benefit of observing the results of certain operations without scrolling to those areas, which are off the screen.

In regard to dependent Claims 6-7 (and similarly dependent Claims 11, and 16), Hoag fails to teach that *the static display of said hovering row is toggled (de-selected) in response to a user input*. However, Gibb teaches that a particular cell is selected for display in the display field. The manner of selecting a cell depends upon the type of software application, but may be as simple as dragging the cell to the area of the screen containing the display field, or invoking a command from a menu or from the keyboard (suggests a plurality of means of toggling). Gibb continues by teaching that once a cell has been selected, the contents of the cell are displayed, regardless of whether the cell is currently displayed in an on-screen window. If the user scrolls the on-screen window so that the cell is no longer visible, the display field nevertheless

Art Unit: 2176

continues to display the cell contents (suggests that the display is static in that it is visible until such time that another cell is selected). If the contents of the cell change, the display field is updated accordingly, to reflect the change. In this manner, the user is able to view the effects on the selected cell of any changes he or she makes to other areas of the document (Col. 2, lines 51-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hoag and Gibb as both inventions relate to the display of tables and also the display of off-screen information in a visible area. Adding the teaching of Gibb provides the benefit of observing the results of certain operations without scrolling to those areas, which are off the screen.

In regard to dependent Claim 8 (and similarly dependent Claims 13, and 18), Hoag teaches that *said hovering row is displayed only if all columns outside said viewable area can be displayed in said hovering row* in that pane 511 displays the first table segment, comprising the first group of columns in sequence that will fit in the width of workspace 340. Pane 512 displays the second table segment, comprising the remaining columns in sequence that will fit in the width of workspace 340. Each pane has a height determined by dividing the height of workspace 340 by the number of table segments. The number of panes and dividing lines depends upon the number of columns, the width of each column, and the width of the available space (Col. 4, lines 54-62). This would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that only a set number of columns will be wrapped to the lie below the first set of columns, thus not allowing columns that wouldn't be visible to be displayed unless

they were first wrapped to succeeding rows. Again, Hoag does not explicitly teach that the rows are hovering. However, Gibb teaches a hovering row in a prior art depiction of a table where columns labeled G-J are overlaying columns labeled E-H. Columns I-J were off screen and not visible previously (Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hoag and Gibb as both inventions relate to the display of tables and also the display of off-screen information in a visible area. Adding the teaching of Gibb provides the benefit of observing the results of certain operations without scrolling to those areas, which are off the screen.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
04/07/2006

William D. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
4/13/2006